

clear what the examiner is considering “a plurality of reference signal sources.” Figures 8 and 10 of Karmi discloses determining the location of a mobile appliance based on the TDOA of a signal transmitted from a mobile appliance **received at a plurality of base stations**. Clearly, the signal being transmitted by the mobile phone is not a reference signal. However, if the examiner considers the signal transmitted by the mobile phone to be a reference signal, then Karmi discloses locating a mobile appliance from a single reference signal source received at a plurality of base stations. Thus, even under the examiner’s interpretation, there is no disclosure in Karmi of locating a mobile appliance from a plurality of reference signal sources. Reconsideration and allowance of Claim s 26-30 is solicited.

Claim 26 is allowable for the additional reason that disparate communication systems are not disclosed in Karmi. For example, Claim 26 recites, *inter alia*, that the “signals transmitted from the mobile to the locating station are representative of the difference in time of arrival at the mobile appliance of pairs of signals from the reference signal sources in disparate communications systems”. Karmi does not disclose receiving reference signals at the mobile phone, let alone receiving reference signals from different communications systems. Note that Figure 8 is an illustration of determining location of a mobile phone based on the signal transmitted from the phone “measured at two base stations.” (Col. 4, lines 66-67.) Note that the bases stations are in the same communications system. Reconsideration and allowance of Claim 26 is requested.

Claim 27 depends from Claim 26 and is therefore allowable with Claim 26 without recourse to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

The examiner relies on Fig 10 to reject Claims 28-30. However, its not clear what the examiner considers to be "a plurality of reference signal sources" or the "locating station." If the examiner maintains this rejection, the applicant requests that the examiner read each element of the claim on Fig.10 so that applicant is given the opportunity to address the examiner's rejection.

Reconsideration and allowance of all Claims 26-30 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Patrick D. McPherson
Reg. No. 46,255
L. Lawton Rogers, III
Reg. No. 24,302
D. Joseph English
Reg. No. 42,514
Mark C. Comtois
Reg. No. 46,285

1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 776-7800
Telecopier: (202) 776-7801

Dated: June 10, 2004